



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—STUDIES IN ETYMOLOGY, II.

In KZ. 36, 103 Pedersen presents a brief and interesting discussion of the phenomenon of Greek ζ- = Skr. *y*- and Latin *j*-. In place of the usual transcription for the primitive Aryan speech of spirant *j*- and semivowel *ǰ* (the latter for cases where the spiritus asper stands in Greek, e. g. in *ἡπαρ*: Skr. *yákṛt*-, Latin *jecur*) he favorably considers Havet's transcription by *ǰǰ* and *ǰ*, respectively; and makes the suggestion, exempli causa, that *ǰǰ* is a reduction of *ǰǰi*-, noting that this initial group has not been found, though *ǰǰ* and *ǰǰi*- are attested, the latter by Skr. *hyás*, Gr. *χθές* 'yesterday' (cf. Latin *heri*, without trace of the *ǰ*). In the history of the Germanic dialects, on the other hand, *-yy-* gave rise variously to *-ddy-* (Gothic) and *-ggy-* (Old Norse). In this paper I shall use *y* for *ǰ*, and the Old English guttural spirant *ȝ* for *j*.

The examples for the phenomenon under discussion, extracted from Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik § 115, are, so far as Latin is concerned, the following: ζυγόν, Skr. *yugám*, Lat. *jugum* 'yoke', with their verb systems; ζύμη 'leaven', Skr. *yūṣam* 'soup', Lat. *jūs*. True, objection to the latter cognation has been raised of late by Bally (Mém. Soc. Ling. 12, 314), on semantic grounds, viz.: that ζύμη 'leaven' was alien in signification to the other words, which mean 'soup', but this objection seems to me irrelevant as long as Latin *fermentum* 'leaven' comes from *fervet* 'boils', while French *bouillon* 'soup' similarly comes from *bouillir* 'to boil'.

The above examples show of course that *j*- in certain Latin words corresponds to ζ- in Greek¹ and to *y*- in Sanskrit, but they are valid only for the equation of Latin *ju*- = Greek ζ_v- = Skr. *yu*-, and do not further prove that Latin *je*-, say, would be the normal correspondent for Gr. ζε- Skr. *ya*-.

¹ I cannot doubt but that this ζ- is in some cases the product of *dy*-, e. g., in ζυγόν 'yoke' and ζωστός 'belted', both ultimately cognate, I take it, with δέει binds, Skr. *dy-dti*, from a root *DĒ(y)*. With a Sanskrit pair *sydti* 'binds': *syū-ma* 'band', we might infer beside *dy-dti* 'binds', a **dyū-ma*, cognate with Skr. *yāuti* 'binds', with lost initial *d*-. Projecting this conclusion back on the primitive period we get a base (D)YEW-.

For all we know, primitive *ǵe-* may have had a different history in Latin from *ǵu-*, just as in Old English the normal representation of primitive *ǵu-* and *yu-* is *iu-*, but primitive *ǵe-* and *ye-* yield *ǵe-* (cf. Sievers-Cook, Old English Grammar, § 175).

These considerations lead me to propose the following etymologies, in which Gr. *ζε-* and Skr. *ya-* will correspond to Latin *ge-*.

(1) Lat. *geminī* 'twins', Skr. *yamās* 'coupled', Old Irish *emuin* 'geminī', from a Celtic stem **ǵemno-s*.

(2) Lat. *gestit* 'desires eagerly, burns' [cf. *fervet* 'boils, desires eagerly'; *furit* 'boils (Aeneid, i. 107), desires eagerly' (Horace, Carm. i. 15, 27)], Skr. *yāsyati* 'becomes hot, (boils), exerts oneself, strives'. For the semantic chain, cf. also Old Bulg. *kypěti* 'to seethe', Skr. *kūpyati* 'is angry', Latin *cupit* 'desires'.

If these etymologies are to be rejected, and *geminī*: *yamās*, in spite of Weber's advocacy, has long been rejected, it will not be because the words in question show any incompatibility on the side of their signification.

If the proposition that Latin *ge-* represents primitive *ǵe-* should arouse in our minds the hostility of surprise, this hostility may perhaps be dispelled by noting, in addition to the Old English analogies mentioned above, that the reduction of *ǵye-* (I speak now in the terms of Pedersen's hypothesis) to Latin *ge-* may be compared with the equivalence of Latin *he-* (in *heri*) with Skr. *hya-* in *hyās* (cf. Gr. *χθής*: primitive **ǵhyes*, **ǵyhes*).

Difficulties still remain, however, for solution. Latin *aemulus* 'rival' and *imitatur* 'rivals, imitates' have been paired with Skr. *yamās*; *aemulus* being by some, e. g. Uhlenbeck, ai. Woert., s. v. *yamās* (cf. Hirt, Ablaut No. 654), explained from a base *ayem-*: while Thurneysen (KZ. 32, 566), who has meantime omitted his explanation from the Thesaurus, derived it from **ad-yemolos*. But the cognation of *aemulus* and *imitator* with Skr. *yamās* is so far from simple that there would be little room to hesitate about preferring the cognation I am defending between *geminī* and *yamās*, if this were all. On the other hand, *geminī* has been compared with Skr. *vi-jāman-* 'related, corresponding', *jāmis* 'leiblich verschwistert', and Thurneysen (l. c., footnote) would find in *geminī* a contamination of both these derivations, that is, make it akin to both *yamās* and *jāmis*. Inasmuch as English *kin* is so apt a translation for both *vi-jāman-* and *jāmis* I cannot bring myself to separate this pair of words, *-jā-man-* and *jā-mis*

(with suffixal *m*), from the root *jan* and from Avestan *zāmi-*, 'posterity, children' (cf. German *kinder*, English *kin*, both cognates of this root). This consideration leaves the preference for Old Ir. *emuin* = Latin *gemini*: *yamás*, always provided that Latin *ge-* be proved the equivalent of Skr. *ya-*, Gr. *ζέ-*. The second etymology suggested, viz. *gestit*, Skr. *yásyati*, Gr. *ζέει* ('boils, boils with passion'), though giving room for no valid objection on the semantic side, calls for an account on the morphological side why *-t-* has been added to *ges-*. In view of the narrow range of the *-te-* suffix in Latin verb inflexion (but cf. Feist's explanation of *sentire* in his *Gotische Etym.* No. 495; and now Brugmann in I. F., 15, 76), we should perhaps explain the *-t-* of *gestire* as left over from an iterative inflection, *gestare*, attracted to the flexional type of the synonymous verb *cupire*; cf. the double inflexion of the verb concretely synonymous with *gestire*, viz. *bullare*, *bullire*, 'to bubble, boil'.

(3) *gerit* 'raises, bears'. An obvious objection would be felt to the separation of *gestit* from *gerit*. But after all, does our explanation of *gestit* separate it from *gerit* any more than the two already lie apart in point of meaning? A satisfactory etymology of *gerit* still halts (not Osthoff's [*a*]g-es-, at any rate).

I cannot satisfy myself with the derivation of *gestit*,—which exhibits but two senses (1) 'desires, cupit' (2) 'is eager, fervet',—from the noun *gestus*,¹ with the signification of 'gesticulates'.² It is just as impossible, starting with *gestit* 'cupit, fervet' to account for *gerit* with the signification of 'bears, carries', etc. But it is open to us, by mediating between the two, to try and derive *gerit* and *gestit* from a common source.³

I take it that *ζέει* 'boils' exhibits, not a primary, but a secondary sense of the root *-ges-*. The Germanic cognates (most con-

¹ This difficulty touches the meaning, not the form, as *artire* 'to joint' stands beside *artus* 'a joint'. Otto (in I. F. 15, 25 sq.) supposes that derivatives in *-lire* and *-täre* stood freely beside one another, setting up, e. g. a type **captire/captäre* [?contaminated in low Latin **captiare*, whence French *chasser*], for which he cites only *artire*, later *artäre*, as an actual authentication: a better pair were the coeval *gestire/gestare*, both kept alive because of their different meaning.

² Pace Sittl, *die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*, p. 10. In a passage like Plautus, *Bacch.* 596, *ita dentifrangibula haec meis manibus gestiunt*, 'heaving' is an interpretation as apt as 'gesticulating'.

³ Cf. the approximate semantic parallel in Lith. *grėbiù* 'rapio': Lett. *gribēt* 'velle'.

veniently examined in Kluge's Etym. Woert. s. v. gären) mean 'to ferment, foam'; among these are German *gischt*, English *yeast*, cf., for the signification, English 'leaven', colloquial 'rising', and German 'die hefen', all of which suggest that the bubbling of boiling and fermentation may have got its name from a verb meaning 'to raise' (trans.), 'rise' (intrans.). With a primary notion of heat in this verb we have nothing to do, any more than in Latin *bullit* 'bubbles'. Traces of the sense 'raises, lifts' are not altogether absent in derivatives of *gerit*, for instance in *agger* 'mound', *congestus* 'pile', *suggestus* 'platform'; perhaps also the ancient phrase *re bene gesta* (Persa, 754, and often) meant originally much the same thing as *praedam tollere* 'to lift plunder'. It is very easy, if we start with 'lifts' as the primary notion of *gerit*, to account for its subsequent development as a synonym of *fert* 'bears', for the perfect of *fert* is *tulit*, which means precisely 'lifts'.

It happens very appositely that the development of significations here assumed is of record in the Germanic languages in the history of the verb *heben*—and here I will follow closely Paul's Deutsches Woerterbuch, s. v. *heben*—which seems originally to have signified 'to grasp, seize' but already in primitive Germanic exhibited the general sense of (1) 'lifts, raises'; specialized in (2) English *heaves*, used of 'the bubbling and boiling of the swollen sea'; and in (3) German *die Hefen*, a word for 'leaven, rising'. A corresponding classification of the progeny of primitive *ges-* yields (1) Lat. *gerit* 'lifts, raises, bears'; (2) Gr. *ῥέει* 'heaves, boils, bubbles', corresponding, in little, to the usage cited for English *heaves*,—and so, in the figurative use only, does Lat. *gestit* 'fervet, cupit'; (3) English *yeast* 'die Hefen'. Old High German *jesan* 'to ferment, foam' and *yeasty* in the phrase "yeasty wave" show the close relation of (3) and (2), while *yeasty* in "yeasty spirit" suggests Latin *gestit*.¹

(4) *gemma*, *germen*, 'bud, sprout, button (of a plant)'; *gisma* 'annulus'. The derivation of this pair of words from primitive

¹ I permit myself a passing suggestion to the effect that the *g-* of *gären* and *gischt* may constitute for German also a record of a difference between the history of primitive *Ze-* and *ye-*, if we might assume that the *j-* which is recorded in the older Germanic forms was an inexact orthography for a sound that was neither a guttural spirant (*ǵ*) nor a semivowel (*y*) precisely, but a tertium quid whose earlier orthography with *j-* was quasi rectified by another approximation with *g-*.

Italic *gesma* and **gesimen* is phonetically sound, and it seems plausible to derive them from the same root. If we are right in defining *gerit* by 'raises', then *gemma* and *germen* mean 'a rising, swelling'—or in the language of dictionaries—'a protuberance on a plant'. The same metaphor is seen in the phrase 'the buds swell'; and in French *bouton*, German *knopf*, *knospe*, 'bud, button' etc. Or the connection of sense might be made directly with the root *zes-* 'bubbles, boils', defining *gemma* by 'knob, stud, bulla' (: *bullat*, *bullit*).

Of course there are other explanations current for *gemma* (see Stolz, Lat. Gramm. p. 88) but a certain attest might seem of record for **gesma* in the glosses (see Goetz's Thesaurus, s. vv.) *anulus* 'gisma' and *gisma* 'angulus', *gemma* in the sense of 'signet-ring' being well known. The glosses have preserved *dusmum* also for *dumum*.

(5) *gerro*: *congerro* 'trifler, idle fellow'; 'a jolly companion, playfellow'; *gerrae* 'nonsense' (i. e. 'frothing'). Greek *φλύει* is rendered by 'boils over, bubbles up, chatters', and *φλέει* has much the same meanings. This makes me raise the query whether Latin *gerrae* is, after all, borrowed from the Greek, according to the engaging story reported by Festus, cited in our lexica and defended, with not altogether satisfactory semantic readjustment, by Sonny in Archiv, 10, 377. This entire Sicilian tale may be but a bit of ancient etymologizing, for ancient etymology was quite capable of combining *Gerrae* with *Crates*, or with Greek *γέρον*, and of inventing a tale to back up the etymology. The way seems open therefore to derive *gerrae* 'nonsense' from **geserae*, a formative type related to the root *zes* of *ζει* 'boils' as Skr. *iṣirā-s* (cf. Gr. *ιερός*, Doric *ιαρός*) is related to the root *iṣ-*. The form *gerro* would be secondary to *gerrae*, just as that Plautine soul, Appuleius, fashioned a *nugo* to *nugae*, cf. the gloss of Placidus, *gerro* 'nugator dictus a gerris'. The alleged cognation of *gerro* with Hesychian *γράσων*· *μωπέ*, *ἀνούστανε* presents difficulties, and *γράσων* (for **γάρσων*) may well be cognate with Lat. *garrit* 'chatters'.

(6) *gemit* 'sighs, groans'.

I am not prepared to pronounce the cognation of *gemit* and Gr. *γέμει* 'is full of' entirely unsatisfactory on semantic grounds, but the problem of correlating the meaning of these words is difficult, I submit. It may accordingly be worth while to note our English idiom *heaves a sigh*, and German *Seufzer heben die*

Brust. In view of the obvious physical character of the sigh, which these locutions attest, the phrase *heaves a sigh* is very like the psychological phenomenon to which grammarians have given the name of *figura etymologica*; cf. also in French the locution *pousser des soupirs* (*gémissements*) 'to heave sighs (groans)'. In English *heave* is specialized as a noun in the sense of 'an impulse to vomit', and in veterinary medicine *heaves* is the 'panting respiration of a porsy horse'; in French such a horse is *un cheval pousseif, qui pousse*. Accordingly we might define Latin *gemit* by 'heaves (sc. a sigh)', intransitive, as *heaves* 'has an impulse to vomit' is intransitive. This definition admits of our connecting *gemit* with Skr. *yāmati* 'heaves, raises, holds.' Note Truc. 599, me intuetur gemens ('heaving'), | traxit ('having fetched') ex intumo uentre suspirum.

In view of the secondary definition of Sanskrit $\sqrt{yam-}$, chiefly in the flexional type *yācchati*, by 'offers, presents, gives', it is interesting to note that Luther used *hebe* of an 'offering' to God (cf. English 'heave offering'), and *heben* for 'to offer'.

The cognation of *gemit* with Skr. *yāmati* is not in conflict with the cognation, not certainly correct, of $\xi\eta\mu\alpha$ and *yāmati* (cf. Prellwitz and Uhlenbeck in their lexica, s. vv.), since we may write * $\xi\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}ti$ as the primitive form for *gemit* and *yāmati*.

(7) *Gemoniae*, *gemiones*, *gemursa*, etc.

Executed criminals at Rome were dragged up-stairs from the Tullianum and exposed upon a place called *Gemoniae*, popularly interpreted as the 'sighing' place. Popular etymology may in this case be authentic, but our somewhat vague information lets us wonder if the *Gemoniae* was not an elevated framework, a sort of stocks or shambles, cognate with Skr. *yan-trām* 'Schranke'; or if *Gemoniae* is, more vaguely, a general place of insult and torture, we might compare *yan-trin-* 'torturer'; *yan-trām* and *yan-trin* both derive from *yāmati*. The former definition, quasi 'barrier', seems to be borne out by the gloss *gemiones* 'mac(h)eriae' (= 'enclosures, walls').

The ancient word *gemursa* 'swelling, rising under the toe' might be regarded either as a cognate of Skr. *yāmati* 'raises' or, if derived from *ge(m)mursa*, of *gisma*, *gemma*, as explained above.

The glossic words *gemina* 'peristromata' ('coverings') and *geminiscus* 'καρπόδεσμος, ligatura brachiorum febrientibus' (= 'bandage'), though of possible primitive derivation from the

root of Skr. *yámati* 'binds', are liable to explanation as of secondary Latin origin: in connection with *gemina* we might think of our own phrase 'double blankets', and *geminiscus* we might define by 'coupler'; besides, *geminiscus* is near enough like its Greek synonym *λημνίσκος* to owe its origin to a scribe's mistake.

To recapitulate: in order to reconcile Skr. *yamá-s* 'coupled', O. IR. *emuin* 'twins' (from Celtic **jemnos*) with Lat. *geminī* 'twins', we lay down the hypothesis that Lat. *ge-*, Skr. *ya-* (Gr. ζε-) derive from Aryan *ǵe-* (*ǵē-*, *ye-*). The evidence to confirm this is furnished, A. by Lat. *gemit* 'heaves (a sigh)': Skr. *yámati* 'heaves'; (possible cognates of the same root are *Gemoniae*, if meaning something like 'framework', and *gemiones* 'macheriae'); B. by sundry Latin cognates of the Aryan root *ǵes-* 'to heave' (Gr. ζέει 'fervet', Skr. *yásyati*, *yéṣati* 'fervet, furit'), to wit: (1) *gestit* 'fervet, cupit'; (2) *gerit* 'heaves'; (3) *gemma*, *germen* 'swelling, protuberance, bud' (cf. *gisma* = *gemma* 'signet ring'); (4?) *gerrae* (from **geserae*) 'froth, nonsense'.

To the equation in A. I attach no strong evidential value. The etymologies in B. seem to me of some cogency, though in varying degrees, certainly of a cogency strongly to confirm the cogent premiss, Latin *geminī* = O. Ir. *emuin* 'twins': Skr. *yamá-s* 'coupled'.

(8) *per-ierat* 'forsewars': *iūrat* 'swears'.

The only positive appeal against the recognition of *ǵes-* in the Latin words cited under B. must come from those persons, if there are any, who accept the validity of Brugmann's attempt (I. F. 12, 396 fg.) to explain Lat. *per-ierat* 'swears falsely' as a cognate of Gr. ζέει 'boils' and Skr. *yásyati* 'ardet'.

On semantic grounds alone this explanation of *perierat* is entirely out of court, and the old explanation is capable of phonetic defence, a defence that has already been rendered in part. Warren (in Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., 32, 110 fg.) has noted that *iūrat* 'swears' (from **iovesat*) would suffer in compounds a phonetic development different to the history of the simplex. Starting from **per-iovesat*, he reduces it to *periuerat* (*periuērat*) and, relying on dialectic forms like Febrarius for Februarius (Februarius?) justifies the loss of *u* in the heavy consonant group. This phonetic history appears to me possible, but not proved, inasmuch as *-riū-* is susceptible to other simplifications. Instead of reducing the *-ou-* of *-iovesat* to *u*

(*v*), it seems to me we should rather reduce its *-io-* to *i*. I can, to be sure, cite no other case of this precise reduction, which is scarcely to be wondered at in view of the small number of Latin words with initial *io-*. For suffixal *io/i* we might cite *alius/alis*, *gratia/grates*, but there is more than one plausible explanation for the shift *io/i* in suffixes. Resting, however, on the analogy of the compounding form of *iacit* (viz. *-icit*),¹ and on the evidence of *bigae* (from **bi-iugae*) we may safely suppose that **per-ioverat* would have been reduced to *periverat*. The *v* of *periverat* might optionally fall away as in all the perfect verb forms with *-ive-*, leaving *perierat* which, for all that the metres attest, may everywhere be read *p̄ri(v)erat* in Plautus. Not only so, but Plautus MSS show *periūrat* where the metre demands *perierat*, and if *peri(v)erat* be restored it enables us readily to account, on purely palaeographical grounds, for the unmetrical reading *periūrat*. On this we cannot insist, however, for *periūrat* as a 'recomposed' form might naturally slip into the place of *p̄rierat*. But *peri(v)erat* may be read in every place where the metre demands *periūrat* as well as where it demands *perierat*, and it is not unlikely, however insusceptible to demonstration, that Plautus knew only *peri(v)erare*, not both *perierare* and *periūrare*. The subsequent reduction of *peri(v)erare* to *perjerare* proceeds on normal lines of sound change (cf. Brugmann, Gr. i,² § 251).

A pun between *perirem* and *perieret* seems to lurk in the following passage, if we bear in mind how Plautus continually rings the changes on *perdere/perire* (e. g. in Bacch. 1015, *si plus perdundum sit, perīisse suaviust*),

Bacch. 1028 ego ius iurandum verbis conceptis dedi,
daturum id me hodie mulieri ante vesperum,
priusquam a me abiret. nunc, pater, ne *perierem*
cura. * * *

1039 verum, ut ego opinor, si ego in istoc sim loco
dem potius aurum quam illum *corrumpi* sinam.
duae condiciones sunt: utram tu accipias vide:
vel ut aurum *perdas* vel ut amator *perieret*.

(9) *aemulatur* 'sequitur'.

The cognation of Lat. *gemini* 'twins' with Skr. *yamā-s* 'coupled', as maintained above, would seem little probable if the connection of *yamā-s* with Lat. *aemulatur*, defined, for etymological purposes, by 'sucht gleich zu kommen' (cf. Uhlenbeck, got.

¹ Metrifactions like *cōnicit* are due to 'recomposition'.

Woert. s. v. *ibns*, and Hirt, Ablaut, No. 654) is right, both being derived from a dissyllabic root *ayem-*.¹ But if we get a satisfactory account of *yamás* by defining it 'coupled, paired, a brace' (: *yámati* 'binds') there is no very good ground for connecting it with Lat. *imago* 'picture', Goth. *ibns* (English *even*) whose primary meaning lies uncertain between 'level' and 'equal' (cf. the Oxford Dict. s. v. *even*).

If we record a verdict of non liquet against *aemulatur*: Skr. *yamás*, Goth. *ibns*, a positive explanation of *aemulatur*, from a different point of attack, would be in order. To this I now address myself. I would seek to establish for *aemulatur* (and *imitatur*), not the rendering 'sucht gleich zu kommen', as cited above, but 'sequitur, follows, pursues' (cf. Livy, 1.18.2 *aemulantes studia* "pursuing their studies"). The Latin glosses (see Goetz, l. c.) exhibit the lemmata *imitantur* 'secuntur' and *amitatores* (i. e. *aemitatores*, *emitatores*) 'adsectatores'. Conformably, Lewis and Short's lexicon renders *secuta sunt* (Caes. B. C. i. 2) by 'have followed, imitated'; and *sectatur* (Tac. Ann. i. 80) by 'seeks to imitate'; cf. also, *consequor*, I. B. 2, a. Further, Liddell and Scott define ἀκολουθεῖ by 'is like'. I would, in line with this definition, connect *aemulatur* with the Homeric nonce-word αἶμων (also once used as a proper name, Λ 296),² which occurs in the following context (E 49): . . . Σκαμάνδριον, αἶμονα θήρης Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος ἔλ' ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι ἐσθλὸν θηρητῆρα . . . The ancient critics gave to αἶμων, here, a quasi etymological interpretation, defining it by *δαιμων for δαήμων 'sciens', but we need not take seriously this interpretation by a, perhaps purely imaginary, rhyme word. A satisfactory interpretation, so far as the context is concerned, for αἶμονα θήρης is 'follower, pursuer, taker of game (of the chase)', 'θηρητῆρα' in short. If the tautology of this

¹ It looks very plausible, we may admit, to derive Lat. *aemulatur*, Skr. *yamás* and Lat. *imitatur* from a common root with the grades *ayem-*, *yem-*, *im-*, respectively; but we might make as seductive a chain by deriving Lat. *aestus* 'boiling, undulating' (of water; cf. *aestas* 'summer'), Gr. ζεστός 'boiled', Skr. *istakā* ('terra') cotta' (cf. coquit 'cooks, boils') from a root *aḡes-*, *ḡes-*, *is-*, supposing intervocalic -ḡ- to be treated like -y- in Latin, as it seems to be in Skr. *yégate* (from **yaysate*), which belongs to this very root, *ḡes-* (cf. Pedersen, l. c., and Brugmann Grund.² i, 922). So long as examples of intervocalic -ḡ- have not been identified in any Aryan speech, we may not certainly pronounce that said -ḡ- (-*iz-*) behaved differently from -y-.

² Not, I take it a pet name for Εὐ-αἶμων (Brugmann, Gr. Gram.³ §165, 1), but rather of the type of Στράβων (ibid. §165, 2).

interpretation raise objection, that objection disappears before a passage like β 65, . . . περικτίνας ἀνθρώπους οἱ περιναϊεάουσι . . . in which the relative clause merely paraphrases περικτίνας (cf. also α 1, γ 383, θ 551, ι 271, χ 136, ι 123).

We may, because of the rough breathing in αἴμων, derive it with some confidence from αἰμῶν-, *αἰσμον.¹ If αἴμων has been correctly defined by 'pursuer, taker' we may explain αἰμύλος 'flattering' as a development on the lines of English *taking* 'captivating', and define αἰμύλος in its bad sense of 'wily' by Latin 'captans'.

The root to which I refer *aemulatur*, αἴμων and αἰμύλος is *ais-*, for which Brugmann (Grund., i i, § 670) cites the derivatives Skr. *ichāti* 'seeks', Umbr. *eiscurent*² 'poposcerint, arcessierint', Armen. *aic* 'undertaking' O. H. G. *eisca* 'demand', Lith.

¹ For the phonetic sequence whereby the rough breathing of αἴμων came to represent the lost -σ- of *αἰσμων I refer to Hirt's Griech. Gram. § 236, d. where, however, only one convincing illustration of the 'law' is cited, viz. ἡμαι 'I sit'. Even this illustration is not convincing till an examination of the Homeric usage reveals that forms of this verb with the sound sequence ἡμ- (for ἡσμ-) are, in a total of over 200 occurrences, more numerous than all the forms in ἡσ- (for normal ἡς-) etc. Thus we may be willing to concede that the spiritus asper spread from the 1st person and ptc. (ἡμενος) forms throughout the entire verbal flexion.

By this principle of sound change we may also account for the spiritus asper of εἵματα 'clothes', ἱμάτιον 'garment' whence, by analogy (note the frequent etymological figure of which εἵματα ἐσάμενος, β 3, may be taken as a type), ἐννυμι 'I dress' which would in truth be entitled to a normal rough breathing in the perfect forms εἵμαι and εἰμένο- (2 and 15 times respectively in Homer); or did -σν-, like -σμ-, yield -νῃ- (cf. the Prākritic change of -sm-, -sn- to -mh-, -nh-)? As we may thus account for the origin of the spiritus asper in the Greek root *Feσ-* 'to clothe', so we might charge the breathing of ἐστία 'hearth' and ἐσπερος 'Vesper' (root *Feσ-* 'to burn') to the analogy of the (secondary) aspiration of ἔως (for *ἐῆως) 'dawn' and εὔει (for *εὔηει) 'singes'; not forgetting, however, the possibility that ἐστία 'hearth' may have been affected by ἔζεσται 'sits,' cf. especially the compound ἐφέστιος 'sitting on the hearth'.

Query: is the rough breathing of ἡμέρα 'day' also secondary—cf. Doric ἄμαρ (Homeric ἡμαρ) ἡμέρα (without intention, of course, to broach the problem of psilosis in the Homeric dialect, and of the correctness with which the aspiration was subsequently restored to the archaic portion of the Homeric vocabulary)—caught up from ἔως, ἐσπερος?

² Von Planta, Gram. § 66, in view of *ē* being the normal sequent in Umbrian of primitive *ai*, adjusts the difficulty of *eis-curent*, which would otherwise be a solitary offender against the usual sequence, by a derivation from **eh-isc-* or primitive **is-sko-*. But primitive *ei* also yields *ē* (though there may have been a slight acoustic difference between the two *ē*'s) and here again *ei-* appears,

jëszkëti 'to seek' (see other cognates in Uhlenbeck's ai. Woert. s. v. *ittë*).

A single basal definition of *ais-* is hard to give. In view of certain of its progeny, to be cited presently, it seems to enjoy a range from (1) 'capit, takes, seizes' to (2) 'captat, chases, (sequitur), covets, desires, entices'¹; and it makes little difference, semantically, whether we call *capit* the completive (perfective) of *captat*, or *captat* the inceptive (desiderative) of *capit*; cf. also Skr. *āpnōti* 'acquires, obtains': *īpsati* 'seeks, covets'; and Latin *properat* 'procures' (trans.) but 'hastens' (intrans.).

The entire semantic range projected for *ais-* lies transparent to our scrutiny in the Greek denominative verb *θηρᾷ*, which means not only 'chases, pursues, seeks' = 'captat, consequitur' (2); but also 'captures, hits, attains' = 'capit, consequitur' (1).

One further meaning (3) that we may expect to find for *ais-* will be 'hastens' (intrans.), cf. *contendit* and *properat* in their intransitive signification.

In accordance with the semantic considerations advanced above I would derive *aemulatur* '(con)sequitur' from the root *ais-* 'follows'; cf. Gr. *αἰμῶν* (from **αισμων*), 'follower'.

(10) *imitatur, imago*.

The Latin glossists consistently define *aemulatur* by 'imitatur', and our modern lexica, with more or less hesitation, have recognized the words as cognate. No phonetic obstacle hinders us in fact from deriving *imago* from **ismāgo* (*is-* in gradation with *ais-*), through the intermediate form *immāgo*, actually of record in the glosses, and attested (?) by Italian *immagine*: whether this *-mm-* is genuinely early, or only a late gemination, my control of the sources will not permit me to conjecture. But whatever value we give to the spelling *immago*, it is in entire accord with Latin phonetics to derive *imago* from **immāgo*, as we derive *omitto*

contra legem, in *eikvasa tis eikvasese*, and *eitipes*. As to the last, the notion of 'umlaut' from the syllable *-ti-* suggests itself; and it seems curious that the two former words agree with *eiscurent* in being followed by a group of similar phonetic constitution, *-k v-* and *-scu-*. In all these cases I take *ei* to be an opener sound than *ē* (cf. von Planta, l. c. § 71), and the Umbrian syllables *-scu-* *-kv-* and *-ti-*, themselves tolerably open, might well have "cast their shadow before."

¹ Lewis and Short define *captat* by I. 'strives to seize, lays hold of with zeal, longing, chases' (cf. French *chasser* from **captiare*), II. A 'strives after, desires earnestly;' II. B 'seeks to catch in a crafty manner, entices, allures.'

from **ommitto*; or we might eliminate the intermediate stage **immāgo*, and proceed at once from **ismāgo* to *imago*, cf. *Cāmenae*, old Latin *Casmenae*. Other instances of the phenomenon under discussion are conveniently collected in Vendryes, *Intensité Initiale* § 72, with the omission, however, of the doublets *Cāsmēnae/Cāmēnae*, *cāsmillus/cāmillus* (cf. also the doublet *gemma/gisma*, as explained above, p. 166).

The derivation of *imitatur* from **i(m)mitatur*, **ismitatur* presents difficulties. It is conceivable, to be sure, (1) that a word beginning with a trochee (spondee) before its accented penult might have been reduced from $-\bar{\cup} \angle \bar{\cup}$ to $\cup \cup \angle \bar{\cup}$, if the trochee owed its long syllable to a double consonant. I can adduce no other examples of such a phenomenon, though one might plead *bālistārius* (: *ballista*, but see Froehde, BB. 3, 286), or Catullus's *lāserpīciferis* (7. 4), neither of which will rouse conviction. Another possibility (2) would be to suppose that **i(m)mitatur* was brought into conformity with *i(m)māgo*: also not convincing.

It is not with *imitatur* that we must start, but with its primitive **imātur*, inferred from *imā-go*, cf. *vorāgo*: *vorat*; *forā-go*: *forat*; *orī-go*: *orīri*; *prurī-go*: *prurit*; *scaturī-go*: *scaturit*. The shortening of **imātur* from **ismātur* would entirely accord with the shortening of *Cāsmēnae/Camēnae*.

A possible trace of *imitatur* might be claimed for Plautus, viz. *Asin.* 372, where, without emendation, the first half of the *septenarius* would be read

móx quom Saúream ímmitábor,

and one need not be an out-and-out hiatus-hater to deny the cogency of Leo's (palaeographical) defence of the hiatus here by comparing the hiatus with the same proper name in vs. 85,

dotálem servom Saúreām uxór tua,

for the coupling of the hiatus and syllaba anceps (in the 4th thesis of the *senarius*) constitutes an important difference (see my edition of the *Mostellaria*, *Introd.* § 14, 11; and cf. *Cpt.* 159, 362; *Curc.* 438; *Men.* 327, 506; *Ps.* 58, for cases of syllaba anceps without hiatus).¹

¹ The Plautine usage (and there seems to be no other occurrence of *imitatur* in the pre-Vergilian poetry, save Livius Andronicus, *Achilles*, 1, 1, *si malos imitabo*, where *malos* is not clear in its reference) would seem to bear out the notion that *imitatur* originally meant 'follows'. At least it seems to me reasonable to suppose that a verb in the earlier stages of its restriction to a

(11) *ira* 'anger, Grimm'; *aerumna* 'anguish, Gram'; Avest. *aēšma* 'fury'.

Brugmann (I. F. 12, 401), in explaining *aerumna* from **ad-jerumna* (: *ges-* 'to boil'), declares roundly that *aerumna* has nothing to do with *ira*. One may wonder why he is so confident. The words are not alien semantically, cf. Lat. *tristis* (1) 'sad', (2) 'angry'; and a convincing separation of *ira* from *aerumna* can be made only after proof rendered that the -*r-* of the one is primitive, but of the other a rhotacized -*s-*. In point of formation Avest. *aēšma* 'fury' seems to bridge the way from *ira* to *aerumna*.

In view of Gr. *ῥμερος* 'longing', correctly derived in my opinion from **ῥσμερος* (: *aīs-* 'to seek'), and not from **ζμερος* (so Bally, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* 12, 321), it would seem probable that *aerumna* 'trouble, anguish' (from **aesumna*) is an intensified 'longing, desiderium'. Or if we are right in defining *aīs-* by 'to take, seize' we might define *aerumna* by the English word 'a taking' (i. e. "a seizure, as of agitation, illness, pain or the like; hence a predicament; perplexity, trouble . . . a sickness, sore"; so the Standard Dictionary). Or if *aīs-* means 'to haste' we might compare Gr. *σπουδή* 'zeal, pains, trouble': *σπεύδει* 'hastes'. From the same sense of 'to haste (after), to chase', I would derive *ira*, Avest. *aēšma* 'anger', comparing English *hasty* 'choleric' and (Biblical) *haste* 'anger'. Note also *σπέρχεται* 'hastens', but metaphorically 'is angry with'. Further, if we recall the huntsman's epithet of *αἰμων* 'pursuer', we may get at the notion of *ira* 'anger' by comparing German *hetzen* 'jagen, to chase' probable cognates of which are *hass* 'hate' and *hast* 'haste'

somewhat technical sense should still admit of the application to it of the vanishing primary sense. This is eminently the case with *imitatur* in Plautus, so far as the examples under control by the Lemaire index allow one to speak finally, for it is combined with but a narrow range of objects, to wit: (1) fugitive slaves (Capt. 209, Cas. 397, 954); (2) a lizard (Cas. 443); (3) a caterpillar, "naughty beast" (Cist. 727); (4) a dog (Capt. 485); the two person objects are one Saurea 'Lizard' (Asin. 372) and Stratonicus (Rud. 932), in the following context:

post animi causa mihi navem faciam atque imitabor Stratonicum:
oppida circumvectabor.

With all these objects, it is submitted, the sense of 'sequitur' seems to peer out. [But cf. Cas. 657, *imitatur malarum malam disciplinam*.]

Note the persistence of the same connotation in Horace, A. P. 134, *nec desilies imitator in artum*.

(cf. Kluge, Etym. Woert. s. vv). Into this semantic group Skr. *īṣate* 'hastens' also fits.

(12) *aerumnula* 'carrying stick'.

The completive meaning found for *aīs-* was 'capit, takes, seizes'. From this sense we can gain a definition of *aerumnula* (from **aesumnula*), the name of the 'stick with which porters carried their burdens'. If it be objected that 'to take' is not 'to carry' (it is in English), it is well to bear in mind that German *hebt* 'lifts' is cognate with Lat. *capit* 'takes'.

I here recapitulate the cognates so far pointed out of the root *aīs-*, meaning (1) 'captat, chases, pursues, seeks'; (2) 'hastens'; (3) 'capit,—takes, seizes'; *αἴμονα θήρης* (E 49) 'sequentem feras': *αἶμον-*, from **aīsmōn-*; *αἰμύλος* 'captans, taking' (a. 'captivating'; b. 'baleful, wily', cf. *captio* 'fraud, a sophism'); *aemulatur* 'sequitur', from **aesmulatur*; *imitatur* 'sequitur', frequentative to **i(m)mátur*, **ismatur*, cf. *immágo*; *ira* 'a taking, a fit of anger', from **aīsā*; *aerumnula* 'a taking-stick', from **aesumnula*; *aerumna* ('pursuit, longing), cares'.

Perhaps, in view of Gr. *αἶολος* 'swift' (:Skr. *é-vas*, so Prellwitz, s. v.), which seems to be identical in formation with *eváras* (a hapax in RV. 8, 45, 38), an epithet of Soma for which 'sparkling, gleaming' (=Gr. *αἶολος*) is a pat rendering, we should ascribe to *aīs-* a briefer form *aī-*.

Prellwitz has a long list of words with initial *aī-* or *aīs-* for which he gives either no etymological explanation at all or a very questionable one. Quite a number of these admit, both semantically and phonetically, of derivation from the root *aī-s-*, viz. *αἰ-κάλλει* 'flatters, captat'; *αἶμασιά* (from **aīsuma-*) 'enclosure, wall': cf. *cap̄sus* 'pen'; *αἶμος* (from **aīsmo-*) 'thicket' [a chase, hunting ground (?)]; *αἰμωδία* (from *aīsmo-*) 'tooth-ache' [cf. *aerumna* 'pain' (?)]; *αἰνιγμα* 'captio, sophism, riddle'; *αἶννται* 'capit'; *αἰρεῖ* (from **aīspo-*) 'capit' [on this word Prellwitz makes the puzzling remark "*αἰρέω* hat aber die dunkeln Nebenformen aeol. *ἀγρέω*, thess. **ἀγγρε-*": might one extract from these words the definition *αἰρεῖ ἀγρεύει* 'captat, hunts, takes'?]; *αἰσάλων* (? **aīssalōn*) 'hawk, accipiter'(?); *αἰσθάνεται* 'λαμβάνει, accipit, percipit, tenet, takes (with the mind), perceives'. [Till some proof of the lost *F* is found, this explanation of *αἰσθάνεται* is at least as satisfactory semantically, and more probable phonetically, than the current derivation from **āFis-* *θάνεται*. The older derivation of *au-dīt* from **aus-dīt* 'gives ear' (cf. Bréal, *Sémantique*,

p. 106) seems to me, in the light of *aus-cullat* 'lends ear' (see Brugmann, I. F. II, 109), unexceptionable.¹

In casting this long list of Greek words possibly cognate with the root *ai-s-* (1) captat; (2) properat; (3) capit, it has been my purpose neither to criticize nor present, in any detail, other possible explanations of said words. Nothing could be more prejudicial to the real advance of semantics than prejudice and dogma about etymologies. Certainty in etymology is hard to reach. Explanations may be in entire accord with morphological patterns and phonetic laws, and semantically plausible also, without carrying a particle of positive evidence. Thanks to complicated morphological constructions which admit much loss of consonants; thanks to the variety of vowel color and the frequency of the entire suppression of the vowel which jump with our complicated schemes of vowel gradation; thanks to the ease with which our whole wealth of words may be grouped, according to plausible psychological principles, about a relatively, or even absolutely, small number of concepts; thanks to the fact that a group of two or three sounds (letters is as well justified a designation for languages known only in their literary monuments) carries the inner meaning of an enormous quantity of derivatives, while only a few syllables, speaking relatively, of two or three sounds each, are conveniently vocable in any one language; thanks to all these considerations, it is in the interest of good method to remain open-minded to every etymological possibility that conforms to reasonable semantics and the better known principles of sound change. As to the established principles of sound change, it must never be lost to sight that the phonetic laws which are drawn from etymologies are made in turn a test of further etymologizing. The inherent weakness of such reasoning in a circle ought to constitute a warning against dogmatism.

¹ In spite of the Roman feeling that *oboedit* was a compound of *ob* and *audit*, shown by the recomposite *obaudit*, I believe that we must define *oboedit* (i. e. *obēdit*, a misspelling, I take it, for **obaedit*) by 'accipit', noting the glosses *accipit* 'ἀκούει, admittit, audit'. If the root *ai-s-* be correctly defined by (1) sequitur, *ἐπεται*; (2) capit, then *oboedit* (for **obaedit*, from **ob-ai-s-dit*) may be properly defined either by 'ἐφέπεται', or 'ac-cipit'. This resolution leaves intact the cognation of *ob-edīt* with *αισθάνεται*, though it separates *obedit* from *audit*. The abnormal treatment of *obēdit* (for **obidit*) may have proceeded from the simplex, *ēdit* being dialectic (? Umbrian, cf. von Planta, cited on p. 172); or else, when the *z* of **aiz-dit* fell away, along with the compensatory lengthening, the quality of the diphthong was altered. [See postscript.]

For semantic studies it seems to me well to group provisionally about the 'roots' of any language all their possible progeny. We may subsequently learn from the minute correspondences of several kindred languages that our larger group contains more than one incorrect member, but we shall never acquire a feeling, a touch for semantic problems, save by studying numbers of large provisional groups in the individual languages.

(13) *carmen* 'song'; *casmillus* 'priest's apprentice'.

I have never been able thoroughly to give up the feeling that *carmen* belongs with *Carmenta*, the mother of Evander, who was 'fatiloqua' and 'veridica' (Livy, 1, 7, 8, 10), and with *Cāsmēnae*/ *Cāmēnae* 'Muses'.

One who connects *carmen* with *Carmenta* and *Casmenae*; with Skr. *ṣāsman* 'song of praise'; and with Gothic *hasjan* 'to sing' (pace Uhlenbeck, got. Woert. s. v.) has, in fact, much more evidence to rest upon than one who connects *carmen* with Gr. *κᾱρυξ* 'herald', Skr. *kārū-s* 'singer'. We must then derive *hasjan* from a verb *ḥāsýēti* (to which Latin **casiti* would correspond), cf. *carmen* from **casimen*. The pair **casimen*: **casiti* is comparable with *specimen*: *specitur*. It is hardly open to question that the syncope after -r- in **car(i)men* might have taken place earlier than syncope after a mute, cf. the doublet *tegimen*/ *tegmen*; comparable is the complete loss of -e from the impv. *fer*, though Plautus knew the doublets *face*/ *fac* etc.

I further see no solid reason for separating Skr. *ṣāṃsati* 'sings' from *ṣāsti* 'teaches, orders'. The vowel color of the -a- in *ṣāṃsati*—which I derive from *ḥānsēti*, with Skr. *a* from *ə* under a secondary accent (see Wackernagel, ai. Gram. § 5, and his authorities as against Hirt, Ablaut § 15, and his authorities)—is inferred (see Uhlenbeck, ai. Woert. s. v.) from Albanian *thom* 'I say' (from **ḥānsmi*); and the vowel color of the *a* of *ṣāsti* (ib. s. v.) from O. Ir. *cáin* 'law' (from **kāzni*). I venture with great reluctance into the realm of la haute phonétique, but I see nothing to show that Alban. *thom* may not come instead from *ḥēsmi*; and I make O. Ir. *cáin* a cognate of O. Ir. *cadhb* i. e. *cáin* (see Stokes in Fick's Woert. ii² p. 67), deriving the one from **kadvos*, and the other from **kādñis*, cf. Strachan, in BB. 20, who maintains that the phonetic sequence *atn* yields *ān* (p. 8); *etn*, *ēn* (10); *utno*, *ōn*, *ūan* (16); *udno*, *ōn*, *ūan* (16). On the parallelism of *v(o)*- and *n*-stems cf. Pedersen in -KZ. 32, 253, § 17; and now Solmsen, ibid. 38, 438.

With this group I would place Lat. *canit* 'sings', from **kənēti*: the root *kēn*-. I derive Skr. *ṣāsmi* 'I teach' and Alban. *thom* 'I say'—for their semantic correlation cf. Gr. *δείκνυσι* 'shows': Lat. *dicit* 'says, speaks, sings (as a poet)'—from **kē(n)smi*, not with "unstable" *n*, but with an *n* lost in the heavy consonant group, and analogically lost in enough forms more—cf. the paradigm of *εἰμι* in Greek for the numerous forms in *ἦτ*-, for or beside forms in *ἦσ*-, where the lost -*σ*- is due to the forms in *ἦμ*—to yield a base *kēs*-, *kəs*-, (Gothic *hazjan*), established as a byform to **kēns*-, *kəns*- (Skr. *śāṁsati*, with accent secondarily shifted as in *gācchati*, *yācchati*), *kṇs*- (Lat. *censet*). That a first person **kē(n)smi* 'δείκνυμι, dico' (for this definition cf. not only Alban. *thom*, but also the O. Bulg. and O. Persian cognates cited by Brugmann, I. F. 1, 177, 9) was liable to very frequent usage needs no demonstration. We may illustrate the correlation of ideas in *śāṁsati* 'sings' and *ṣāsti* 'teaches, shows' by comparing Latin *doctus* 'poet'. The Greek poet also often functioned as a διδάσκαλος (teacher).

The priest's apprentice at Rome was similarly *cāsmillus*/*camillus* 'Lehrling, pupil', cf. Skr. *ṣiṣ-yas* 'pupil'.

(14) Skr. *hīṁsanti* 'they injure': *hānti* 'kills'.

In view of Lat. *necat* 'kills' and *nocet* 'injures' there seems no reason to call in question the cognation of *hīṁsanti* and *hānti*. Neither does it seem necessary to waste words about the loss of sharp desiderative force in *hīṁsanti*, for *hīṁsanti* is a synonym in the Rig Veda of *piṁśānti* 'they grind, damage' and, as a synonym, may be closely modelled on it in its acoustic constitution. We might assume a primitive form **ghensōnti*, whose precise phonetic development in Sanskrit is not clear to me (cf. Hirt, Ablaut, pp. 17-18). Johannes Schmidt's present stem **ghi-(gh)n-só-* (Sonanten Theorie 57, sq.) seems to be quite fanciful, but before any one pronounces fanciful the notion that *hīṁsanti* and *piṁśānti* might, as synonyms, have been of effect, the one upon the inflexion of the other, he should note that *φατός* 'killed' (Skr. *hatás*: *hānti*: 'kills') has, in the Homeric compound *μυλὴ-φατος* 'ground-in-the mill' (β 355), the unmistakable sense of 'ground up'.

(15) *oportet* 'it behooves'.

There is no lack of attempts to explain *oportet* (see Vendryes, l. c. 305), all semantically possible, perhaps, but none convincing. In view of the accentual conditions alluded to

above (pp. 173-4), we need not hesitate to derive from **o(p)portet*. This lets us surmise a connection between *oportet* 'it befits' and *opportunus* 'fitting'. Wharton defines *opportunus* by 'conducive' and so derives it from *portare*; cf. Gr. συμφέρει 'it profits'. A curious confirmation of that explanation, on its semantic side, seems to be offered by an explanation of *oportet* in terms of 'it *behoves*'; *behoves* comes from the verb *heaves* 'lifts, bears', compounded with the prefix *be-*. Thus *me oportet* is quasi 'it rises before me' or 'it bears me on'.

In inflection *oportet* is of a piece with its approximate synonym *debet*.

Still another possibility is to connect *o(p)portet* with *pars* and *portio*, and *pars* and *portio* ultimately with Gr. πέπρωται 'tis fated'. Then *opportunus* (: the root *per-*) is to be compared in formation with *fortuna* (: root *bher-*). The semantic relation of *oportet* 'it is necessary', compared with *pars* and *portio*, may be paralleled by Gr. μέρος 'part': μοῖρα 'fate'.

(16) *aperit* 'opens'.

As an illustration of the possibilities of etymology, as sketched above, p. 177, I take up the word *aperit* 'opens'. The great Thesaurus, with a regrettable lack of catholicity in a work intended and likely to impose authority on scholarship, reports Brugmann's derivation from **ap-verit*, to the exclusion of the older derivation from **a(p)-perit* (see Bréal et Bailly, Dict. Etym. s. v. *pario*, and especially Stowasser's Lat.-Deutsch. Schulwoerterbuch, Vorbegriffe, § 35, 5; also note the instructive semantic remarks in Lewis and Short's Dictionary, s. v. *comperio*). One must admit that the comparison of **ap-verit* with Lith. *ât-veriu* 'ich mache auf, oeffne' (cf. Skr. *âpa-vr̥ṇoti* 'uncovers') is perfectly apt semantically, and one may think it likely that if *-pv-* came together in Latin a reduction to *-pp-*, *-(p)p-* would follow (cf. Stolz, Lat. Gram.³ p. 90). But why *ap-* (and *op-*) with **verit*, but *a-*, *ab-* (*ob-*), with all other compounds of verbs in *v-*? True, the lack of the simplex constitutes a difference in the case of **verit*; and yet, in view of the Oscan-Umbrian stem *vero-* 'door' (cf. also my derivation of *vestibulum* from **vero-stabulum* 'door-stead', Amer. Jour. Phil. 24, 62), one may wonder why the compound **ap-verit* (and **op-verit*) was absolved from the treatment usually accorded to *ab-* in composition with *v-*. Further, to allow that the phonetics of this explanation of *aperit* is correct, we must suppose the compound *apo-ver-* to have lived on into Latin

from the primitive Aryan speech. This is a somewhat different problem from noting that Latin preserves compounds the simplex of which is of record only in some other language, e. g. *dissipat* 'scatters'; Skr. *kṣipāti* 'flings' (if this is correct); for it leaves us to account for *apo-* dissociating itself in this one word from *apo-* in all other Latin words.

If we had of record **ap-verit* and **op-verit* [and here only is it necessary to suppose *op-* (:ἐπι) rather than *ob-* (:Ο. Bulg. *obi*), cf. Uhlenbeck ai. Woert. s. v. *abhi*; Delbrueck, Vergl. Gram., Syntax, iii, p. 681], no one would dream of calling in question the cognation with Skr. *āpavṛṇoti*; but as *aperit* fails to authenticate **ap-verit* past all suspicion, one must not pin his faith, past recall, to this construct form.

What obstacle blocks the derivation of *aperio* from **ab-pario* with the older etymologists? The verb *parit* 'produces, procures' belongs closely with *parat* 'makes'; a pretty complete rendering for both in their entire range of usage is German 'schafft' (macht). A verb of such general signification easily comes, in combination with prepositions (adverbs of direction), to signify 'to open, to close'. Examples are German *aufmacht*, *aufthut* 'opens', *zumacht*, *zuthut* 'closes'; English *undoes* 'opens' (cf. Plautine *aperitin fores* 'won't you undo the door?'); also cf. Homeric ἀν-ίησι 'opens' and Latin *obicit* (Liv. i. 14, 11), *obducit* 'covers'. Such semantic developments are numerous enough to give us pause before we yield a final assent to the contention that *aperit* 'opens' comes more convincingly from **ap-verit* 'covers back', than from **a(p)-perit* 'makes, puts, sets back' (perhaps, with even more definiteness 'splits, cleaves back', cf. Gr. *πέπει* 'cleaves', Lat. *diffindit* 'cleaves apart, opens').

Not only does the old derivation of *aperit* from **a(p)-perit* seem to me phonetically impeccable¹ and semantically plausible, but a little ingenuity will supply other derivations not less plausible than the derivation from **ap-verit*. Thus, if hard put to it, we might derive *apértus* from **ab-portus* 'with the door off' (see Vendryes, l. c. § 301, for the reduction of "post-tonic" -or- to -er-), and deduce the whole verb system from this compound interpreted as a participle.

Going into Greek for cognates, who shall say, barring the difficulty with the -p- pointed out above, that *ap-erit* is not a

¹ The loss of *p* in *apério*, *apérinus* etc., *apériam* etc., *apériui* etc. *apértus* is normal; abnormal only in *dperis*, *dperit* and *dperiebam* etc.

compound in which *-er-* is a Latin cognate of Gr. ἀπαρίσκειν, which occurs in Homer with the sense of 'to close' (act., β 353; ptc. = 'closed', common); cf. also Lat. *artus* 'close(d)'.

Or who shall definitively say that **a(p)-perit* does not mean, by etymological definition, 're-velat'? Thus we might connect it with Gr. σπείρον 'cloth, wrap', with σπάρον 'rope', Lat. *sporta* 'plaited basket', all from a construct base *spera-* 'to plait' (so Prellwitz, s. v. σπείρα), with "unstable" *s-* (cf. the groups of cognates printed by Prellwitz, s. v. σπαρτός, and by Uhlenbeck, ai. Woert., s. v. *parhām*, though, to be sure, the roots abstracted by these scholars have a very different definition, and accordingly different lists of cognates).

(17) Latin *parat* 'makes'.

So far as I know it has not been suggested that *parat* and *parit* are cognate with Gr. πρα-κ- in πράσσει 'does, makes' [see Prellwitz, s. v., and note the satisfactory treatment of the semantic relation between πράσσω and περάω (πείρω) in Liddell and Scott's lexicon; comparing also, for πράσσει and πείρει, Homer's διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον 'opening, cleaving a path', β 429, with his πείρε κέλευθον, β 434]. In Oscan we have a possible attest of the affix *-k-* of πράσσει, viz. in the words *comparascuster* (von Planta 17, 4) and *kúmparakineís* (ib. 32). In the Tabula Bantina *comparascuster* is rendered by 'consulta erit', but a rendering of perfect etymological precision and well suited to the connection is 'comparata erit' (cf. Lewis and Short s. vv. 1 comparo, II. B; 2 comparo I. B). I shall not attempt to decide whether *comparascuster* is derived, in Latin transcription, from (1) **compara-scit* (: *comparat* : : *labascit* : *labat*) or (2) from **compara(c)-scit*. The latter reconstruction best accords with *kúmparakineís* (rather Latin **comparac-ionis* than **comparc-ionis*) 'consilii'. It is clear in its context that the council was a sort of 'finance board', a 'board of assessment', cf. Attic πράκτωρ 'tax-gatherer' (see also Liddell and Scott, s. v. πράσσω V. 2). To this special sense *comparascuster* will also conform, meaning, in its context, 'when the fine has been assessed'. The primitive Italic base *parā-c-* conforms better, in point of gradation (cf. Hirt, Ablaut, No. 187) with Gr. πρα-κ- than a base *parc-* would conform.

Nothing decisive has been made out in my opinion for the contention that Oscan *comparascuster* is a cognate of Lat. *com-pescit* (see von Planta, § 296, 3 for the literature). In the examination of *compescit* too much account has been taken of

the consecutive entries in Festus (de Ponor, p. 42, lines 21-22) comperce pro compesce dixerunt antiqui, comparsit Terentius pro compescuit posuit. We are fortunately able to control the ipsissima verba on which these lemmata are based, viz., (1) Plautus Bacch. 463 caue malo et compesce in illum dicere iniuste, in contrast with Poen. 350 comperce me attricare; (2) Terence, Phormio 43-44 quod ille unciatim vix de demenso suo | suum defrudans genium, comparsit miser. If now we observe that Plautus could say (Poen. 1035) maledicta hinc aufer, linguam compescas face 'away with this cursing and hold (shut up) thy tongue', we will hardly challenge his saying compesce in illum dicere iniuste 'hold (shut up) thy speaking ill of him'. It did not require a particularly ingenious grammarian to compare this use of *compesce* 'shut up' (= 'don't') with *comperce* in comperce me attricare 'spare to (= don't) lay thy hand on me'; and, when he had made this identification, to contort into a further "Belegstelle" the Phormio citation, where de demenso suo . . . comparsit 'spared (saved) from his allowance' lent itself to the interpretation "pared (clipped, pruned) from his allowance". The proper philological comment on this interpretation of the form *comparsit* was made long ago in the Westerhov Terence, to wit: absurdum videtur.

The etymological interpretation of *compescit* seems to me most simple, along the semantic lines laid down in Lewis and Short. I derive it from **com-pag-scit* (: *pangit*) or **com-pac-scit* (: *paciscitur*) 'fastens, holds, keeps together'; its synonyms are *coercet*, *cohibet*, cf. Cato R. R. 139, *coercere* (with derived sense 'to clip, prune') *sacrum* (sc. *lucum*), with the entry from Festus, *compescere lucum est lucum suis finibus cohibere*. These passages show that in all three verbs the sense of 'dress, trim, clip, prune' had developed from a general sense of 'hold, keep together, arrange, dress'.